

13th August 1929]

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II

ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, under Standing Order No. 20 I beg to move for an adjournment of the business of the House.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order. The hon. Member has not obtained my consent. I have been frequently stating that to move an adjournment motion, obtaining the consent of the President is a condition precedent. No member will be allowed to make the motion in the House without previously obtaining the consent of the President.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ I only want to submit, Sir, that in this particular case I did not want to act upon the private information of the hon. the President given in his chamber refusing his permission. I have not got any communication to that effect. Moreover, Sir, . . . ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member has applied for my consent and it has been refused. No member is justified in rising to address the Chair without the previous consent being obtained on a motion for adjournment.”

III

THE MADRAS SERVICES COMMISSION BILL.

Clause 7—cont.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I should inform the House that yesterday when the House adjourned, Mr. Satyamurti's amendment to omit clause 7 was voted upon by the House. Now there are no other amendments to the clause. The effect of the vote of the House given yesterday was practically to retain clause 7. According to the usual practice there should be a question from the Chair that the clause shall be added to the Bill. Such a procedure will give room for the same question being repeated to the House. I have therefore come to the tentative conclusion that it is a mistake to allow an amendment to omit a particular clause as such an amendment would have the effect of a negative vote within the language of Standing Order No. 32 (2). Mr. Satyamurti's amendment was of that kind and comes within the purview of that Standing Order. Therefore, hereafter I propose not to allow such amendments. I am of course prepared to hear any hon. Member who desires to offer his remarks on the matter. In this case, however, instead of again proposing that clause 7 be added to the Bill, I take it that the effect of the negative vote that the clause should not be omitted, which the House gave yesterday is to affirm that clause 7 be added to the Bill. I do not propose therefore to put a separate question to the House.”

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir, this is a motion that the Bill be taken into consideration. Under the Standing Orders, the President is empowered to put the Bill clause by clause to the House. Therefore, it should be clear that the motion that a particular clause be passed by the House has not come before it. The hon. the Revenue Member's motion is that the Bill be taken into consideration. Once that motion is made, the whole Bill is before the House. For the sake of concentrating discussion in the House, you are to put clause by clause of the Bill to the House. My submission is that an amendment to omit a clause is not negative in form but is a positive amendment to this extent, namely, that the Bill be taken into consideration except